

MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION
OF THE MEETING OF SENATE

Held on Friday, April 11, 2008,
immediately following the Closed Session
in the Norman D. Hébert, LLD Meeting Room
(Room EV 2.260) on the SGW Campus

PRESENT

Voting members: Mr. M. Bani Baker; Prof. R. Cross; Dr. L. Dandurand; Mr. B. Derisi; Mr. M. Di Grappa; Prof. C. Draimin; Prof. O. Dyens; Prof. B. Gamoy; Dr. D. Graham; Prof. A. Hamalian; Mr. B. Hamideh; Mr. S. Jack; Ms. K. Kashfi; Dean J. Locke; Prof. W. Lynch; Prof. E. Mongerson; Prof. B. Nelson; Prof. N. Nixon; Ms. A. Novoa; Ms. A. Peek; Prof. M. Peluso; Prof. M. Pugh; Ms. C. Reimer; Prof. J. Segovia; Prof. F. Shaver; Ms. M. Sheppard; Prof. P. Stoett; Prof. C. Trueman; Dean C. Wild; Prof. W. Zerges

Non-voting members: Dr. D. Boisvert (*Speaker*); Mr. R. Côté; Mr. W. Curran; Mr. L. English; Me B. Freedman; Me P. Fréreau; Ms. L. Healey; Mr. A. McAusland

Also attending: Dr. R. Bhat (*Acting Dean, Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science*); Dr. G. Kanaan (*Acting Dean, John Molson School of Business*); Dr. M. Mulrennan (*Acting Associate Dean, School of Graduate Studies*)

ABSENT

Voting members: Mr. W. Chan; Mr. K. Diaz; Prof. A. English; Dean N. Esmail; Prof. M. Jamal; Mr. J. Redler; Dean S. Sharma; Associate Dean T. Stathopoulos;

Non-voting members: Ms. E. Morey

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 2:25 p.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda

R-2008-4-4 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Peluso, Wild), it was unanimously resolved that the Agenda be approved.*

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of March 14, 2008

R-2008-4-5 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Wild, Nixon), it was unanimously resolved that the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of March 14, 2008 be approved.*

4. Business arising from the Minutes not included on the Agenda

Further to queries about the status of the exploratory committee regarding the Joint Senate/Board of Governors task force on university governance, Dr. Dandurand conveyed that, as discussed at the last Steering Committee meeting, there had been great difficulties to find suitable dates. Furthermore, given the recent intensive discussions around governance, it was felt that it was more appropriate at this time to put the discussion on hold until the arrival of the new President to see how she wishes to pursue this matter. Nevertheless, it was suggested that this exercise could continue but that the discussion on the key elements could be put on hold until Dr. Woodsworth's arrival. Dr. Dandurand replied she would see what she could do.

4.1 Quorum requirements

Me Freedman reported that a review of University practices has revealed that while the Board of Governors and Senate officially refer to Robert's Rules of Order in their procedures, Councils and other deliberative bodies of the University have no specific rules, in which case the custom has been to refer to Robert's Rules of Order which calls for the following:

- When no quorum is specified in the By-Laws, the majority of voting members (50% + 1) constitutes quorum;
- In the absence of quorum no business can be transacted;
- It is the responsibility of the Chair to verify the presence of quorum before beginning;
- If, after a reasonable delay, quorum is not present, the meeting should be adjourned.

However, in the absence of quorum, when actions are necessary, the deliberative body can make decisions which must be ratified at a subsequent meeting where quorum is present. Accordingly, as a practical solution for the past issue of lack of quorum, Me Freedman has suggested to Dr. Dandurand that, at a future meeting of the Council of the School of Graduate Studies where quorum is present, a resolution ratifying all previous actions be adopted. Going forward and in the absence of quorum, the Council can either choose to adjourn or to take actions which would be ratified later as provided hereinabove.

Dr. Dandurand confirmed that the necessary measures are being taken to ensure that quorum is present, while noting that the composition of the Council, at the origin of the problem, is being reviewed and will eventually be brought to Senate for approval. Prof. Lynch, who had brought this issue to Senate's attention, thanked Me Freedman for his comprehensive report as well as Dr. Dandurand for her efforts to correct the problem.

5. Report of Senate Standing Committees

5.1 Academic Planning and Priorities (Document US-2008-4-D2)

There was no discussion on this report.

5.2 Finance (Document US-2008-4-D3)

Committee Chair Ollivier Dyens informed Senators that the Finance Committee had met yesterday. However, since he will be away for the May 2 meeting, he said that the written report, including recommendations with respect to the budget, will be filed at the May 23 Senate meeting.

A discussion ensued, during which Prof. Dyens and Mr. English responded to questions of clarification regarding some budget lines contained in the document entitled *Budget Evolution 4 years updated*, appended to Document D3 and which had been provided to Senators as a follow up to the last Senate meeting. It was pointed out that this appendix did not provide the level of detail which had been requested at the last meeting regarding the increase of administrative salaries. Mr. English answered that, at yesterday's Finance Committee meeting, he had presented a sheet outlining categorized salaries (professors, researchers, administrators, etc.) which he will include in the documentation for the May 23 Senate meeting.

Some Senators also commented that this summary was insufficient and asked that an itemized document be provided. Namely, Ms. Novoa noted that she could not find the line indicating where the money was going further to the collection of the technology fee, adopted by the Board last Fall.

Prof. Dyens reminded Senators that the Finance Committee's mandate is to analyze the budget for the perspective of academic priorities and draw out the academic implications of the budget. Mr. English added that this document was meant to be a summary and that the actual budget documents are more detailed.

Prof. Peluso formulated a specific request for an itemized account of monies spent on legal costs, dismissal and departures, etc., in order to understand why expenditures in these areas have escalated substantially. Mr. Di Grappa replied that the Vice-President Finance submits a detailed budget and financial statements to the Board of Governors, broken down by sector, with projected and actual results. However, the level of detail requested is not provided to the Board, nor would it be appropriate to provide such detail.

5.3 Library (Document US-2008-4-D4)

There was no discussion on this report.

5.4 Research (Document US-2008-4-D5)

As supplementary information to the written report, Dr. Dandurand informed Senators that the Research Committee had met yesterday, at which time it discussed the debriefing of funding programs, the strategic research plan and the framework for support of research units.

6. Report and recommendations from the Academic Programs Committee (Document US-2008-4-D6)

6.1 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – John Molson School of Business (Document US-2008-4-D7)

In response to a query on how many courses belong to eConcordia as opposed to the University, it was stipulated that all credit courses, irrespective of their mode of delivery, are owned by the Faculties.

R-2008-4-6 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Kanaan, Segovia), it was unanimously resolved that the major undergraduate curriculum changes in the John Molson School of Business, set out in Document US-2008-4-D7, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2008-4-D6.*

6.2 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science (Documents US-2008-4-D8 and D9)

R-2008-4-7 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Mulrennan, Lynch), it was unanimously resolved that the major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer, set out in Documents US-2008-4-D8 and D9, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2008-4-D6.*

7. Presentation on Corporation Valéo Inc.

Using a power point presentation, Dr. Dandurand gave the background which led to the creation of Valéo's predecessor, Valorisation Innovation Plus. A lot of discussion has occurred over the last 15 years on how to protect intellectual property. There has been an overall movement to promote technology transfer programs. While some argue that the protection and commercialization of research is not part of the core mission of universities, it is part of the overarching mission of creating, sustaining and disseminating research.

Recognizing that the vast majority of universities did not have adequate support and resources to promote and commercialize university-based research, in 1999 the Quebec government created Valorisation-Recherche Québec, a non-profit organization with the mandate to support team research in Quebec universities and to encourage the commercialization of research results for the social and economic benefit of Quebec society. Four research corporations were created. Concordia's commercialization portfolio is managed by Valéo Management Limited Partnership, originally established in 2001 with three other limited partners, UQAM, ETS and UQAR. In January 2008, three other universities, UQTR, UQAT and UQO, joined as limited partners and shareholders in Corporation Valéo. Dr. Dandurand specified that save for INRS, all Quebec universities are members in research partnerships.

Dr. Dandurand continued her presentation by explaining the legal structure. Each university partners with Valéo in its own limited partnership company, of which the university retains 99.9% ownership rights. Valéo is the general partner of each of the university limited partnership. As such, Valéo is responsible for assessing the patentability and commercial potential of the intellectual property assigned by the partner universities to their respective

limited partnership company. Where deemed appropriate, Valéo will pursue patent protection and commercialization, primarily through licensing activities or the creation of spin-off companies of such assigned intellectual property. The gross revenue generated from the commercialization of such assigned intellectual property is held in the name of the university limited partnership form which the intellectual property originated and is disbursed annually as follows: 95% to the relevant university and 5% to Valéo. Valéo Management is itself a limited partnership whose general partner is Corporation Valéo. The shareholders in this corporation are the universities whose commercialization portfolios are managed by Valéo.

Dr. Dandurand noted that Valéo's role is to maximize the potential for economic exploitation and commercialization of university results and enumerated the various services offered to its limited partners in fulfillment of this role. She then reviewed the intellectual property management process as well as Concordia's investment and returns, giving details on the distribution of revenues mechanism. In conclusion, Dr. Dandurand underlined the many tangible benefits which are derived through Concordia's partnerships with Valéo as well those that go well beyond the tangible gains. Further to the presentation, speaking privileges were extended to Ms. Shelley Sitahal, Manager Industry/Partnership in the Office of Research.

A discussion ensued, during which Dr. Dandurand and Ms. Sitahal responded to questions from Senators. Mr. Derisi noted graduate students' dissatisfaction with the way in which their intellectual property is handled in the University and the GSA's willingness to participate in a joint committee with the Research Office to review related policies.

8. Remarks from the President

Mr. Di Grappa recalled that at the March Senate meeting, it was agreed that the SCAPP report on strategic positioning be forwarded to the Faculty Councils for further discussion. As of today, Messrs. Patrick Kelley and Brad Tucker and himself have attended three Councils meetings to discuss the document. A series of town hall meetings is scheduled to be held over the next weeks to allow discussion and input from the faculty, staff and students. Moreover, a website has been set up which contains the relevant documents and provides a mechanism for members of the community to provide feedback on the process (<http://www.concordia.ca/strategicplanning/>). Additionally, President-elect Woodsworth has fully approved the process and is being kept apprised of its evolution.

The President also said he was remiss that, at the last meeting upon thanking Dr. Graham and Dean Locke for accepting their new roles, he had inadvertently omitted to formally acknowledge and thank Dr. Dandurand for having served as Interim Provost from September 18, 2007 to March 1, 2008. Dr. Dandurand stepped into the role during a critical point in Concordia's history and performed her duties with great skill, fairness and good humor.

9. Update on the search for a Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science

Dr. Graham apprised Senate that the Advisory Search Committee has decided on its preferred candidate and will be seeking approval of its recommendation at the April 17 Board meeting.

10. Items for information

There were no items for information.

11. Question period

In response to a question from Prof. Draimin as to whether or not letterhead bearing the Coat of Arms would be made available to those who want to use it, Mr. Di Grappa replied that the Graphics and Standards Manual sets out the guidelines which must be followed pursuant to the adoption of the visual identity last year. However, he will bring this issue to the attention of Mr. Parisella.

Further to Prof. Cross' query with respect to the timeline of strategic positioning consultation, Mr. Di Grappa noted that a communiqué will be sent out next week conveying the dates of the town meetings. The public consultation phase is ongoing and the community will have ample time to provide its feedback over the next months.

Ms. Novoa asked whether the Finance Committee had discussed the potential international student fee increase at its last meeting, to which Prof. Dyens answered that the committee can discuss this at its next meeting.

Prof. Peluso wondered why JMSB is offering online courses through eConcordia when the Faculties can teach those same courses and asked that the advantages and disadvantages of online courses be stated. Mr. Di Grappa opined that it would be inappropriate to answer at this time since those issues are currently being discussed at the collective bargaining table. Prof. Peluso disagreed, stating her view that those are academic issues. Dr. Graham reminded Senators that those issues are addressed in the report of the strategic initiatives committee on e-learning. He noted that this committee comprises several faculty members, and that its report is posted on the strategic planning website.

12. Other business

There was no other business to bring before Senate.

13. Next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Friday, May 2, 2008, at 2 p.m.

14. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

Danielle Tessier
Secretary of Senate